

### REMARKS

In the present Office Action, claims 1-58 are pending. Claim 1-58 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0182447 A1 (“Schilling”).

In the present response, Applicants amend all the independent claims, 1, 18, 36, and 40, to recite the limitation of “*intelligent* rules-based analysis.” The present amendments are not meant to limit the breadth and scope of the claims, but merely to bring out explicitly matters inherent to these claims.

The Applicants also respectfully request to schedule an interview if any of the aforementioned amendments do not result in allowance of claims 1-58. The undersigned can be reached at 206-903-2461, Monday through Friday, 8 am to 6 pm.

#### *Rejection of Claims 1-58 Under § 102(e)*

Claims 1, 18, 36, 40 are the independent claims. Claim 1, for example, recites the following:

In a computing system, a method for providing automatic universal resource locator (URL) analysis in connection with a process implicating a URL input mechanism, comprising:  
receiving URL input from a client computing device;  
analyzing the URL input and determining whether the URL input is valid;  
when the URL input is invalid, performing intelligent rules-based analysis of the invalid URL input; and  
suggesting at least one alternative URL based upon said analysis.

(amendment underlined). Applicants wish to impress upon the Examiner the type of analysis that is being performed in the recited subject matter. Per the most recent response, Applicants pointed out the following:

Some common errors that the *intelligence* of the invention fixes include: postfixing “.com” to “www.yahoo”, prefixing “www” to “hotmail.com”, changing “ww” to “www”, converting commas to periods, deleting trailing commas, converting the invalid input “www.nasa.com” to “www.nasa.gov” and changing “wwwwww” to “www”.

(Specification, p. 14, ll. 2-8 and p. 18, ll. 1-4) (emphasis added). Thus, based on one of the examples above, if a user types in “www.nasa.com”, an intelligent fix can be provided—“www.nasa.gov”—because NASA is governmental organization not a commercial one.

Contrast this to Schilling. In Fig. 2, the top-level domain of “com” would not be altered in such a case to “gov”, since the disclosure of Schilling would already consider “com” to be correct. It is this lack of *intelligent* suggestibility that distinguishes Schilling from the claimed subject matter – and why the claimed subject matter patentably defines over Schilling.

As mentioned already in the previous response, dated June 3, 2005, Schilling merely discloses a generic top-level domain re-routing system. As is clear from Fig. 2 of Schilling, a root zone file is provided where the file corresponds to a set of supplemental DNS entries for pseudo top-level domains (TLDs). These pseudo TLDs each correspond to a mis-typed version of one of the TLDs specified in the root zone file (para. 19). All Schilling discloses, then, is a type of mapping mechanism where a root like “.com” maps to a potentially mistyped roots like “.cpm” or “.cokm”, or “.comm”, and so on.

The Examiner contends, however, that the recited subject matter can allegedly be found on page 3, paragraphs 19-21 and 23-34 of Schilling (Office Action, p. 5, dated September 8, 2005). Specifically, the contention is made that “the root server receives an address from a client that is mistyped (for example “.met” instead of “.net”) it provides (based on a program) the correct address of the server.” *Id.* However, the type of mistypings Schilling intends to fix “are common mis-typings for .com, resulting from adjacencies of various characters on a standard QWERTY keyboard” (para. 19), in other words, “typographical error[s]” (para. 23) or “common mis-spellings” (para. 20). These fixes should not be conflated with the kind of *intelligent* fixes provided by the claimed subject matter (e.g., changing “www.nasa.com” to “www.nasa.gov”, based on the knowledge that NASA is a governmental entity).

The other independent claims recite similar limitations: “analyzing the URL input and determining whether the URL input is valid and if invalid, transmitting said URL input to a server computing device for *intelligent* rules-based analysis of the invalid URL input” (claim 18) (emphasis added); “analyzing the invalid URL input based upon *intelligent* rules-based analysis of the invalid URL input” (claim 36) (emphasis added); “means for analyzing the URL input and means for determining whether the URL input is valid and if invalid, transmitting said URL input with a means for transmitting to a server computing device for

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-0767/186581.01  
**Application No.:** 10/073,618  
**Office Action Dated:** September 8, 2005

**PATENT  
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO  
37 CFR § 1.116**


analysis based upon *intelligent* rules-based analysis of the invalid URL input” (claim 40) (emphasis added).

Claims (a) 2-17 and 55, (b) 19-35 and 56, (c) 37-39 and 57, and (d) 41-54 and 58, depend either directly or indirectly from independent claims (a) 1, (b) 18, (c) 36, and (d) 40, respectively, and thus are considered allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-58 patentably define over Schilling. Withdrawal of the rejected claims and allowability of the newly introduced claims is thus earnestly solicited.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submits that Claims 1-58 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner’s earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: November 8, 2005

  
Grzegorz S. Plichja  
Registration No. 55,541

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439